



WWW.AZCLIMATECHANGE.US

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY SECTOR GHG REDUCTION POLICY OPTIONS

CCAG MEETING #2, SEPTEMBER 29, 2005

<u>Indicative Potential Emission Reductions* -</u>	<u>Indicative cost (\$/tCO₂e)</u>
High (H): Potentially capable of saving at least 1 Million Metric Tons CO ₂ e per year by 2020 (~1% of current AZ emissions)	High (H): \$50/tCO ₂ e or above
Medium (M): Potentially capable of saving from 0.1 to 1 Million Metric Tons per year by 2020	Medium (M): \$5-50/tCO ₂ e
Low (L): Unlikely to yield more than 0.1 Million Metric Tons CO ₂ e per year by 2020	Low (L): \$5/tCO ₂ e or lower
Uncertain (U): Too many unknowns to estimate at this time	Negative (Neg): Cost Savings
* Several measures may overlap in terms of the emissions reductions. Estimates assume measures would be implemented independently from other measures.	

Indication of Priorities:

- **High:** High priority items are deemed deserving of considerable further analysis.
- **Medium:** Medium priority items will be carried forward, with the extent of further consideration and analysis to be determined later.
- **Low:** Low priority items will be moved to a separate list as options to be potentially considered at a later time.

		Priority: High, Med, Low	Implement. Level	Potential Emission Reductions	Cost (\$/tCO ₂ removed)	Other Information, Co-benefits, Feasibility Consideration, Examples of Current Activities
	Agriculture – Production of Fuels and Electricity					
1.1	Manure Digesters (methane recovery and electricity production)	High	State, Local Ag. Ext.	Medium	Neg to Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linked with Option 2.2 below
1.2	Biodiesel Production (incentives for feedstocks and production plants)	Medium	State	Medium	Med to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Production from both virgin and waste vegetable oils; Seed oil production in AZ feasible (e.g. soy and rapeseed)?
1.3	Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity or Steam Production	High	State	Low	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to identify viable feedstocks and volumes [e.g., crop residue (wheat straw, corn stover) or energy crops (switchgrass); Linkage to Energy Supply TWG to determine availability of biomass plants Linkage to RCI TWG to identify available capacity for biomass generated steam
1.4	Ethanol Production	High	State	Medium	Med to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current debate on the energy required for ethanol production
1.5	Convert Diesel Farm Equipment to LNG/CNG or Hybrid Technology	Medium	State	Low	Med to High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LNG/CNG engines or engine conversions reduce BC emissions Availability of diesel hybrid equipment for farm applications?
1.6	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					<ul style="list-style-type: none">
1.7	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Agriculture – Fertilizer and Manure Management					
2.1	Nutrient Management (improve efficiency of fertilizer use)	Medium	State, Local Ag. Ext.	Medium	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note Ag. Best Management Practices under ARS §49-457 (do these extend beyond dust control and water efficiency measures?) Linked to Option 3.4 below.

CCS POLICY MATRIX, AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TWG, 9/29/05

		Priority: High, Med, Low	Implement. Level	Potential Emission Reductions	Cost (\$/tCO2 removed)	Other Information, Co-benefits, Feasibility Consideration, Examples of Current Activities
2.2	Manure Management (practices to reduce methane emissions)	High	State, Local Ag. Ext.	Medium	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linked with Option 1.1 above. Existing waste containment requirements for animal feeding operations > or = 1,000 head. Could include composting and other measures. Most of the benefit achieved at dairies. Co-benefits include reduction of ammonia and VOC emissions.
2.3	Change Feedstocks (optimize nitrogen for N ₂ O reduction)	High	State, Local Ag. Ext.	Low to Medium	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the benefit achieved at feedlots. Co-benefits include reduction in ammonia emissions.
2.4	Reduce Non-Farm (Residential and Commercial) Fertilizer Use	High	State	?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emissions from non-farm application are not currently in the inventory; unclear what the reductions and costs would be.
2.5	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					•
2.6	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					•
Agriculture – Soil Carbon Management						
3.1	Conservation Tillage/No-Till (carbon sequestration and reduced energy use)	Medium	State, Local Ag. Ext.	Medium	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boll Weevil eradication program requires cotton residue to be plowed under (conservation tillage not applicable to cotton)
3.2	Reduce Summer Fallow (increase soil C content, reduce N ₂ O emissions)	Low	State, Local Ag. Ext.	?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicability to AZ? Need estimates of fallow summer acreage
3.3	Increase Winter Cover Crops (increase soil C content, increase soil N content)	High	State, Local Ag. Ext.	?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicability to AZ? Need estimates of winter acreage available for cover crops
3.4	Improve Water and Nutrient Use (to minimize soil C loss)	High	State, Local Ag. Ext.	Low	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linked to Option 2.1 above; Suggest combining these two.
3.5	Rotational Grazing/Improve Grazing Crops and/or Management	High	State, Local Ag. Ext.	Low	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicability to AZ?
3.6	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					•
Agriculture – Land Use Change						
4.1	Convert Land to Grassland or Forest	High	State	Medium	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities for conversion in AZ?

		Priority: High, Med, Low	Implement. Level	Potential Emission Reductions	Cost (\$/tCO2 removed)	Other Information, Co-benefits, Feasibility Consideration, Examples of Current Activities
4.2	Reduce Permanent Conversion of Farm and Rangelands to Developed Uses	High	State, County, City Planning Offices	High	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reductions occur both from higher retention of carbon in soil and lower transportation activity. • Linked to Option 4.3. • Linked to Smart Growth Options in the TLU TWG.
4.3	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					•
4.4	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					•
Agriculture – Farming Practices						
5.1	Organic Farming	Med	State, Local Ag. Ext.	Medium	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reductions occur via lower intensity agricultural practices (nutrient/pesticide application, reduced tillage)
5.2	Programs to Support Local Farming/Buy Local	High	State, Local Ag. Ext.	Medium	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reductions occur through lower transport related emissions.
5.3	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					•
5.4	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					•
Forestry – Biomass Protection and Management						
6.1	Forest Protection – Reduced Clearing And Conversion to Nonforest Cover	High	State, City/ local	High	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • depends on business as usual rates of land clearing and viable alternatives
6.2	Increase Maintenance of Urban and Residential Trees	High	State, City/ local	Low	Low to high	•
6.3	Afforestation of Nonforested Rural Lands	Low	State, City/ local, federal	Low to high	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • depends on available acreage and risk
6.4	Afforestation of Nonforested Urban Lands	Low	State, City/ local, federal	Low to high	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • depends on available acreage and risk
6.5	Reforestation/Restoration of Forested Lands	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low to high	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • depends on available acreage and risk
6.6	Reforestation or Increased Densification of Stands	Low	State, City/ local, federal	Low to high	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • depends on available acreage and risk

		Priority: High, Med, Low	Implement. Level	Potential Emission Reductions	Cost (\$/tCO ₂ removed)	Other Information, Co-benefits, Feasibility Consideration, Examples of Current Activities
6.7	Age Extension of Managed Stands	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> involves significant tradeoffs with carbon savings from harvested wood products, as well as ecological risk
6.8	Thinning and Density Management of Managed Stands	High	State, City/ local, federal	High	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cost and technology barriers to market use of harvested biomass may be high; supply potential is high
6.9	Fertilization and Waste Recycling	Med	State, City/ local, federal	Low	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> site and situation specific
6.10	Expand Short Rotation Woody Crops (for fiber and energy)	Low	State, City/ local, federal	Low to medium	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> depends on available acreage and market demand
6.11	Expanded Use of Genetically Preferred Species	Low	State, City/ local, federal	Low	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> primary issues in the southwest are reductions of fuel load and restoration of native species
6.12	Modified Biomass Removal Practices (reduced decay and energy use)	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> may be opportunities to use biofuels for equipment
6.13	Fire Management and Risk Reduction Programs	High	State, City/ local, federal	High	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implementation and market barriers may be significant, potential is high if biomass is directed to constructive reuse
6.14	Ecosystem Health Risk Reduction Programs (pest/disease, invasive species)	High	State, City/ local, federal	High	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implementation and market barriers may be significant, potential is high if biomass is directed to constructive reuse
6.15	Drought Management Programs (tree selection, placement, protection)	High	State, City/ local, federal	High	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> implementation and market barriers may be significant, potential is high if biomass is directed to constructive reuse
6.16	Flood and Riparian Management Programs (tree selection, placement, protection)	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> depends on available acreage
6.17	Watershed Management Programs (stand retention, enhancement and management)	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low to high	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> depends on available acreage and forest health issues

		Priority: High, Med, Low	Implement. Level	Potential Emission Reductions	Cost (\$/tCO2 removed)	Other Information, Co-benefits, Feasibility Consideration, Examples of Current Activities
6.18	Habitat Management Programs (stand retention, enhancement and management)	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low to high	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> depends on available acreage and forest health issues
6.19	Re-conversion of woodlands to grasslands (e.g. pinon pine and juniper encroachment)	High	State, City/ local, federal	TBD	TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> what are the carbon implications of wood/shrubland conversion from grasslands? Not all TWG members think this is a high priority
6.20	(Additional option, if/as suggested)		State, City/ local, federal			<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Forestry - Wood Products and Waste						
7.1	Improved Mill Waste Recovery	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low to high	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> technology and market dependent
7.2	Improved Logging Residue Recovery	High	State, City/ local, federal	High	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> technology and market dependent
7.3	Expanded Use of Small Diameter Trees for Wood Products and Energy	High	State, City/ local, federal	High	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> technology and market dependent
7.4	Expanded Use of Wood Products for Building Materials	High	State, City/ local, federal	Medium to high	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> technology and market dependent
7.5	Expanded Use of State and Locally-Grown Wood Products	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low to high	Low to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> technology and market dependent
7.6	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					<ul style="list-style-type: none">
7.7	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Forestry – Energy Production						
8.1	Expanded Use of Forest Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity (fuel switching)	High	State, City/ local, federal	High	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> technology and market dependent

		Priority: High, Med, Low	Implement. Level	Potential Emission Reductions	Cost (\$/tCO2 removed)	Other Information, Co-benefits, Feasibility Consideration, Examples of Current Activities
8.2	Improve Use and Efficiency of Wood for Direct Commercial Heat and Energy	High	State, City/ local, federal	High	Low	• technology and market dependent
8.3	Improved Energy Capture from Wood Waste Combustion	High	State, local, private	Low to high	?	• technology and market dependent
8.4	Expanded Landfill Methane Recapture (wood products waste)	High	State, City/ local	Low	Neg to Low	• Federal New Source Performance Standards and Emissions Guidelines require methane capture at larger landfills.
8.5	Improved Commercialization of Biomass Gasification and Combined Cycle	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low to high	Medium to high	• requires improved technology and market incentives
8.6	Expand Usage and or Efficiency of Wood Waste as Residential Fuel Source	High	State, City/ local, federal	Low - Medium	Low	• Overlap with RCI sector.
8.7	(Additional option, if/as suggested)					•